

YOUNGSTOWN, OHIO
VINDICATOR

E. 101,830
S. 157,039

JAN 23 1966

Budget Hides Billion for CIA Doings

By EDWARD J. MICHELSON

(North American Newspaper Alliance)

WASHINGTON — Hidden in the Johnson administration budget for next year is at least \$1 billion to be spent by the Central Intelligence Agency.

The fact that the sum, about 1.1 per cent of all federal expenditures for fiscal 1967, is concealed in the budget estimates is no secret.

But the way in which it is concealed is known only to a handful of veteran legislators. Many of the others have long resented CIA's privacy.

Largest of Several

The agency is the largest of several comprising the "intelligence community." For nearly 20 years, it has never been subjected to review by congressional investigators. Although the main work of the more than 15,000 employees headquartered in a huge building in nearby Langley, Va., has to do merely with research and analysis, the agency also gets involved in cloak-and-dagger work.

It is the rumored blunders in the cloak-and-dagger department—espionage and government-toppling in the Middle East, Cuba, the Dominican Republic, Viet Nam, Singapore and elsewhere — that has whetted the curiosity of long irate congressmen.

As a result, pending bills to subject CIA to closer congressional surveillance are taken more seriously than in past years.

The major bill, which would set up a joint congressional "watchdog" committee for Central Intelligence, has been pushed in the Senate for many years by Montana's Mike Mansfield, now the majority leader.

Got Vote to Floor

In 1956 he was successful in getting the bill to the floor for a vote, where it was rejected 67-29. The opposition of Chairman Carl Hayden, D-Ariz., of the Appropriations Committee, Chairman Richard B. Russell, D-Ga., of the Armed Services Committee, and Sen. Leverett Saltonstall, R-Mass., now the ranking minority member of both units, were responsible for

In the House the chief sponsor is an administration stalwart and ranking Foreign Affairs Committee Democrat, Clement Zablocki of Milwaukee. Zablocki has long felt there should be a check on the competence of CIA agents assigned to strategic overseas service, and on the care with which huge, unvouchered sums are spent.

In the past year, the House forces favoring the watchdog unit have increased as liberal Democratic young turks have offered companion bills. They would go further than tougher surveillance, however. Typical is Rep. William Flitts Ryan of New York, who would strip CIA of all operations and limit its role to research and analysis.

He'll Stand Ground

Senator Saltonstall made clear in an interview that he will stand firm in this, his final year in public life, against any change in CIA's status. He was chief sponsor of legislation in the Republican-controlled 80th Congress setting up CIA as a descendant of the wartime Office of Strategic Services, commanded by the late Maj. Gen. William J. (Wild Bill) Donovan.

Saltonstall says CIA is "a fact-finding agency with no policy-making powers. The agency provides information to the military services and the National Security Council for decision-making. The 'guerilla warfare' activities are undertaken by CIA on orders from higher authority. CIA is assigned them because no other governmental agency is set up for such tasks."

The CIA is cooperative and "forthright" in advising certain committees of the Senate and House about agency activities. "Every meeting I have attended has brought forth frank and

raised," Saltonstall said.

Bill Calls for Review

Sen. Eugene McCarthy, D-Minn., a Foreign Relations Committee member, is sponsor of a bill setting up a select Senate investigative unit to make the first review of CIA in its history, and to report back at the end of next January with conclusions and recommendations for overhaul.

Senator McCarthy says CIA is the only federal agency that has not undergone such a congressional "review" since it was established during the Truman administration. The only investigation that resulted in overhaul was that ordered by President John F. Kennedy following the Bay of Pigs fiasco.

Senator McCarthy says Congress must check out the validity of rumors about CIA involvement in activities far beyond the original scope of the agency. President Truman revealed in 1963 that he erred in approving legislation setting up the agency because he never intended to create a "cloak-and-dagger" service.

Eliminated OSS in 1946

It was Mr. Truman who ordered the Bureau of the Budget to shut down the Office of Strategic Services late in 1946, by cutting off funds. The then president was irked by "now-it-can-be-told" tales of OSS deriding-do in the press, a propaganda effort launched to salvage the wartime agency as the basis for a permanent secret intelligence service.

The secret of how money is funneled into CIA from other agencies is expected to be kept this year. But the growing criticism of CIA promises to result in greater disclosure of how it spends money and under what

Pres. Michelson, Edward J.

CIA 8

Pres. Saltonstall, Leverett

them out. On the other hand, when the CIA's judgment appears faulty, sharp criticism sometimes follows.

A recent article which appeared in the Washington Star and other newspapers seems to me to outline very well some of the special problems which face the agency. It was written by one of the persons most knowledgeable about the work of the CIA, Carl Rowan, former Director of the USIA and former Ambassador to Finland, who has now returned to his earlier occupation as a syndicated columnist. As Ambassador Rowan points out:

A good intelligence system has become as crucial to national security as an army, or air force, or an arsenal of powerful weapons.

I think we should recognize the important role which the CIA has played in our national security. I think, too, that we should give credit where credit is due: Over the years the CIA has done a good job in carrying out the tasks assigned to it. I hope it will continue to do so.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Ambassador Rowan's article be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Sunday Star, Dec. 19, 1968]

REPLY TO CRITICISM OF CIA (By Carl T. Rowan)

Pity the poor old Central Intelligence Agency (CIA). It is the perennial whipping boy of the columnists and Congressmen and of just about every foreign dictator seeking to divert attention from his own crookedness or ineptitude.

As one who knows a bit about CIA (which most of its critics decidedly do not), I get a little sick of seeing it badgered and abused by just about everybody capable of scratching out a sentence or calling a press conference.

Now this may be interpreted as my being in favor of sin (which most people are) but put me on record as saying CIA does a pretty darned good job of protecting not only U.S. security but that of many weaker countries all over the world as well.

True, it makes mistakes. Big ones. But only at about the same rate that the State Department, the Defense Department, the White House or my old agency, the U.S. Information Agency makes boobies.

And you'd be hard pressed to convince me that CIA's ratio of incompetents is any higher than that of the U.S. Senate.

Those who leap to the firing line when they discover it's always open season on CIA seem to ignore one inescapable fact: A good intelligence system has become as crucial to national security as an army, or air force, or an arsenal of powerful weapons.

The foreigners criticizing CIA most (the Russians, President Kwame Nkrumah of Ghana, etc.) know this and nobody expends more effort than they do trying to perfect their cloak and dagger operations.

What we ought not forget is that in many critical situations these last few years, the United States has been able to make the correct decision to guarantee our security because CIA had secured information that our enemies thought we could not possibly possess. The Cuban missiles crisis is an example.

Having said all this, I must concede that CIA is at a critical point in its history. Not

only is it scorned the world over, but the standard device for discrediting the Peace Corps, USIA and other American agencies is to link them to the CIA.

During the recent tour of East Africa and southeast Asia, it was made clear to me that suspicion and fear of "the CIA" has become a sort of Achilles heel of American foreign policy.

This may seem to justify the attacks on CIA in Congress and elsewhere but the truth is just the opposite. The home-grown critics are 100 times more to blame for the wild and irrational foreign fear of CIA than is the agency itself.

A Ghana official recently was lamenting the fact that the United States denied a food request because Nkrumah published a book attacking CIA and labeling just about every American who ever put foot in Ghana as a "CIA spy."

"Are you surprised that Americans would react unfavorably to this kind of attack?" I asked.

"We are surprised that you would direct your anger at us," said the Ghana envoy. "Our President took practically everything he wrote out of American books and other publications."

At a dinner in Lusaka, the Vice President of Zambia began conversation by asking me to give him an appraisal of "The Invisible Government," a book by two of my journalistic colleagues about so-called CIA cloak-and-dagger operations abroad.

I ducked the question by commenting: "I only wish CIA were capable of half the things for which it is blamed or praised."

Several Zambian Cabinet members refused to let me duck, however, and I soon found myself caught in a wild discussion with people who believe fervently that CIA is in the business of overthrowing and installing governments all over the world—without the approval or knowledge of the Secretary of State or the President.

I later learned that every top and middle-level Zambian official had been instructed to read "The Invisible Government," Andrew Tully's book "The CIA," and Morris West's new book "The Ambassador."

I'm not naive enough to suggest that newsmen and authors stop writing about CIA. Our society is naturally intolerant of secrecy (which any good intelligence operation requires), so the questioning and criticism will go on.

But it would sure help if some of the critics conceded that, whether we like clandestine intelligence operations or not, they are indispensable in this crazy, crooked, bellicose world in which we live.

REPLY TO CRITICISM OF CIA

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, for some years now I have been privileged to sit on the special subcommittee which deals with the work of the CIA. Throughout my service on the subcommittee I have been impressed by the dedication of the people working in that agency and by the skill with which they have carried out their very difficult and important jobs. We know that from time to time criticism of the CIA is heard. Unfortunately the many successes of the agency are seldom mentioned in the press and often are not even known since publicity might endanger the success of future programs and even the lives of those carrying